DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 116 HE 009 103

AUTHOR	Fisk, Robert S.; Duryea, E. D.
TITLE	Academic Collective Bargaining and Regional Accreditation. An Occasional Paper.
INSTITUTION	Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	77
NOTE	38p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accreditation (Institutions); Administrative Policy; *Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; Government Role; *Higher Education; Institutional Role; *Unions
IDENTIFIERS	Middle States Association; New England Association of Schools and Colleges; North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

ABSTRACT

In recent decades, an increase in federal and state support for higher education has carried with it a correlative increase in surveillance by government agencies. Although the role of regional accrediting bodies has not yet been challenged directly, state and federal governments have embarked on policies and actions that bear upon their function. Faculty unionization is an important influence affecting the management of colleges and universities, and is thus a new condition that regional accrediting bodies will have to consider. A study was undertaken in 1975 under the auspices of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools to observe the effects of unionization on the accreditation process. The followup study in 1976, reported here, involved the input of the three regional accrediting associations regarded as most experienced with academic collective bargaining: the Middle States Association, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, and the New England Association of Schools and Colleges. (MSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

A report to the Council on
Postsecondary Accreditation,
funded by the
Carnegie Corporation

ACADEMIC COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND REGIONAL ACCREDITATION

Robert S. Fisk
E. D. Duryea
Department of Higher Education
State University of New York at Buffalo

©Copyright 1977

The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036
$2.50

FOREWORD

E. D. Duryea is Professor of Higher Education at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Since he received his doctorate in this field at Stanford University in 1948, his career has included both service in administration to the post of dean and in teaching and research. Prior to joining the State University, he held the position as Chairman of the Program in Higher Education at Syracuse University. His academic work has centered upon the organization of higher education and the history of its government. In recent years he has addressed himself to the problems created for governance by the advent and expansion of the use of collective bargaining by faculty members. In this latter area, he has served as consultant, presented papers at professional conferences, and written extensively. During the past year he conducted a study of the relationship between academic collective bargaining and the role and function of university and college governing boards for the Association of Governing Boards.

Robert S. Fisk is Faculty Professor of Educational Studies at the State University of New York at Buffalo, most recently serving as a member of the faculty of the Department of Higher Education. His graduate education, writing, and experience have been divided between study and teaching in public school administration and administrative roles in higher education ranging from a deanship to (most recently) that of Acting Vice-President for Academic Affairs at Buffalo. During the past half-dozen years he has been involved with academic collective bargaining, first in the role of an active participant as a faculty member in the SUNY bargaining unit at the state and local levels, and subsequently as one attempting to study the phenomenon in a broader context. In this latter role he has been closely associated with Professor Duryea in research and writing and has also served as a consultant and a speaker at professional meetings.

The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation is pleased to be able to present the results of this study by these two distinguished scholars as another in its series of *Occasional Papers*, the fifth published to date.

We thank the Carnegie Corporation of New York for underwriting the bulk of the expenses of this project and especially appreciate the patience and understanding of Carnegie Program Officer James Dyer from initiation to completion of the study.

Only a limited number of copies could be printed within the budget of the grant. In order to increase the circulation of what we consider an important piece of literature to the field of accreditation and postsecondary education, additional copies will be made available for purchase. The sales price will cover our costs of servicing requests for individual copies.

Kenneth E. Young

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study emerged from a continuing concern about the impact of collective bargaining by faculty members upon the character and quality of American higher education. It began with an informal inquiry made in cooperation with the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. It has been possible to enlarge the inquiry through the sponsorship and assistance of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.

In submitting this report of the study, we wish to acknowledge and express appreciation for the most cordial cooperation we received from officers of a number of agencies. They contributed importantly to the findings and observations which follow. The initial survey which produced the basic document for the major study was made possible by the Middle States Association. Subsequently, the executive officers of the Middle States, North Central, and New England Associations arranged and contributed to working seminars. They were joined by college and university administrators experienced in accreditation from the three respective regions. All graciously and most constructively participated in the discussions. We similarly are indebted to the officials from the major university and college associations in Washington, and to officers of the American Association of University Professors, the American Federation of Teachers, and the National Education Association who equally and freely gave their views and insights.

Throughout we benefited from the cooperation and assistance of Dr. Eugene I. Van Antwerp of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation which sponsored the study.

John C. Neddy, doctoral student in the Department of Higher Education and administrative officer at the State University of New York in Buffalo, served as research associate for the study.

The project was financed by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

The report which follows is intended to be analytical and interpretative, and thus we must and do assume complete responsibility for the statements, interpretations, and conclusions.

RSF and EDD

INTRODUCTION

A long established endeavor—regional accrediting of higher education—and a much more recent phenomenon—collective bargaining for faculty and other professionals—can interact in ways that we believe warrant inquiry. Regional accreditation has a distinguished history as a constructive force supporting the improvement of academic quality in universities and colleges. Academic collective bargaining has emerged within the past ten years as a new force with the potential to have a major impact upon higher education. This report reviews the two activities in order to identify major points of interaction and the questions they raise about the accreditation process.

First, we will comment briefly on the nature of accreditation and of faculty unionism, explain the methodology of the study, and identify those aspects of regional accreditation subject to the impact of collective bargaining.

Regional Accreditation and Faculty Unionism

Regional accreditation has achieved major status in American higher education as a universally accepted means for evaluating the quality of colleges and universities. It has supported institutional autonomy against complete governmental control by assuring the exercise of professional judgment in setting and maintaining standards. It has often served in lieu of supervision by state departments and commissioners of education or other governmental agencies; sometimes it has supplemented the efforts of such agencies or acted as critic.

In recent decades, however, an increase in federal and state support for higher education has carried with it a correlative increase in surveillance by governmental agencies. Although the role of regional accrediting bodies has not yet been challenged directly, state and federal governments have embarked upon policies and actions which bear upon its function. Federal agencies, for example, seek to monitor institutions receiving financial assistance, an interest often quite unrelated to overall educational quality. Also, state governments have begun to exercise a more intimate supervision of the public sector. Statewide systems of colleges and universities under central coordinating agencies or boards of control, frequently with unified administrative staffs, have reduced the autonomy of the individual institutions upon which accreditation is focused.

Unions of faculty members have come upon the scene as one more influence affecting the management of colleges and universities, thus presenting a new condition which regional accrediting bodies will have to consider. Originating in the community colleges in the mid-1960s, academic collective bargaining has spread to many four-year state and private colleges, as well as to several graduate universities with a research commitment. The remarkable expansion of unionism is demonstrated by noting that more than 450 campuses had recognized bargaining agents in the summer of 1976; ten years earlier the total was eleven. For this report, several aspects of union development warrant attention.

First, it must be recognized that academic collective bargaining exists on the basis of legislative mandate for public employee bargaining in 23 states, and in all states for private institutions, on the basis of the National Labor Relations Act. While only a few state statutes explicitly include faculty members, it is generally recognized that in public higher education they are public employees and thus are covered by legislation dealing with this category of employees. In 1970, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) extended its jurisdiction to include private colleges and universities with incomes of a million or more dollars. As a consequence of this state and federal action, unionism has a legal status which provides the right of faculties to organize in many colleges and universities and provides for the referral of disputes to external quasi-judicial bodies (the NLRB and various state public employee relations boards) and the courts.

Second, faculty unionism gains considerable strength by an almost universal affiliation with three national faculty associations: the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and the National Education Association (NEA). While most local unions have considerable autonomy in their relationships with the national associations, they nevertheless receive support and, to a high degree, reflect their policies. At public institutions local unions also typically have an affiliation with statewide associations which, in the instances of the AFT and NEA, bring them into concourse with labor organizations and teachers unions. Academic unionism in state college systems is frequently organized on a system-wide rather than an institutional basis. As a consequence, one can anticipate cross currents at work between the state and national character of unionism in contrast to the institutional focus of accreditation.

Third, collective bargaining centers upon reaching agreement on a formal, legally-binding agreement which then serves as the point of reference for future decision-making, implicitly as well as explicitly. Disputes which arise on contractual matters between faculty members and the administration and governing board of an institution may have their ultimate settlement in agencies external to the institution: arbitrators, labor relations boards, and the courts. As a consequence, the traditional role of governing boards as the usual arbiter for institutional affairs has undergone a salient change.

Methodology for the Study

This study was initiated in 1975 under the auspices of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools when we accompanied accrediting teams to three campuses having faculty unions and negotiated contracts. Our purpose was to observe, without active involvement, the effect(s), if any, that the existence of unionism had upon the accreditation process. On the basis of these observations, we prepared *a preliminary* statement speculating on the actual and potential implications of unionism for regional accreditation.

Following this preliminary assessment, a second effort was initiated early in 1976 under the sponsorship of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA). For this follow-up study, the preliminary report was submitted to representatives of the three associations in regions regarded as most experienced with academic collective bargaining—the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, the Middle States Association, and the New England Association of Schools and Colleges. These representatives, in turn, met with the authors in concentrated, one-day working seminars for a critical analysis of the topic. After these three meetings, the authors met in Washington for a similar critical review with representatives of the leading national college and university associations and (separately) with the three national faculty associations.

The report which follows is based upon these five working seminars, the initial site visits for the preliminary report, and related experience associated with other studies of academic collective bargaining conducted by the authors in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. We also have consulted the professional literature on regional accreditation and collective bargaining in higher education.

Function of Regional Accreditation

To interpret the actual and potential impact of faculty unionism, it is necessary to refer at least briefly to the purposes and processes of regional accreditation. For this study we reviewed policy statements by the three regional associations and a 1970 analysis conducted by Dr. Claude Puffer and his associates.[1] Perhaps the most succinct statement of their purposes and processes, however, is to be found in *Major Issues in Accreditation*, the 1976-76 annual report of the President of COPA. We quote from the presidential report, as follows:

> Accreditation actually focuses on two concerns:
>
> > *educational quality*, defined and interpreted within the context of the institution or program's statement of its scope and purpose and compared with similar institutions and programs; and

[1] Puffer, Claude E. *et al*, Director, *Regional Accreditation of Institutions of Higher Education, A Study Prepared for the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education*. Volumes I, II, 662 pp., mimeographed, 1970.

institutional integrity, that the institution or program is what it says it is and does what it says it does, at a given point in time.

Educational quality is evaluated and encouraged by looking at conditions that are believed to be necessary and desirable to assure such quality and evidence, to the extent that it is available, that the institution or program does indeed produce educational quality.

Basic to the accreditation process, of course, are:

institutional self-study, a comprehensive effort to assess the effectiveness of an institution or program in the light of publicly stated objectives, involving a broad cross section of the institution or program's constituencies; and

peer evaluation, expert judgment from outside the institution, usually consisting of professional educators (faculty members as well as administrators), certain specialists according to the nature of the institution or program, and sometimes others representing public interests.

We have attempted in this report to be sensitive to variations among institutions and faculty unions. Although our site visits were limited to two public four-year campuses and a private university—no community college accreditation visit was available at that time—the subsequent seminars included representatives of all categories. Nevertheless, variations among types of institutions must not be allowed to obscure a commonality both within regional accreditation and faculty collective bargaining. Each in its own way exerts significant influence toward central tendency which supports uniformity within higher education. Accreditation rests upon a common assumption, explicit or implicit for all institutions, about academic quality and "sound" institutional management. Collective bargaining encourages a distinctive mode for relationships among faculty members, administrators, and governing boards different from the traditional.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The underlying question for this study was whether the change in faculty-administration relationships associated with academic collective bargaining significantly altered, or had the potential to alter, the criteria and processes associated with regional accreditation.

The general response to this question among the discussants in the five working seminars was affirmative. In the words of a representative from one of the national faculty associations, "All parties related to the accreditation process will have to view it differently; collective bargaining will have an impact upon nearly everything associated with a college or university." His sentiments echoed a viewpoint expressed in each of the study sessions. Unionism just does not exist in isolation; nor does accreditation. Each, therefore, will interrelate with the other to a greater or lesser degree depending upon the institution and issue.

At the same time, a number of discussants urged caution in applying this generalization. Faculty unions constitute, from this perspective, a significant though single facet of the milieu on a campus. As suggested, unionism impacts upon the structure and, to a degree, the nature of the academic functioning of an institution; it establishes a different set of relationships and organizational climate for administrators; it alters the basis upon which faculty members exercise an influence in the formation and implementation of policies. Yet, as discussants stressed repeatedly, accreditation must concern itself with outcomes, with the extent to which a college or university carried out its stated mission. Accrediting teams on campuses and regional associations in general cannot help but recognize the existence of faculty collective bargaining, but their primary obligation must lie with the total institution.

The tensions between the above two emphases—that of the clear impact of unionism and that of the need for accrediting to stress outcomes rather than means—pervaded the discussions of the study. Participants recognized the significance of collective bargaining, yet no consensus emerged regarding the extent to which accrediting associations and teams should deal with it directly. In this regard, faculty unionism was subsumed within the broader question: should accreditation limit its evaluation to achievement of mission outcomes or is more attention given to conditions and practices which lie behind achievement? We suspect that in practice no clear delineation between the two holds up; and that

this same observation carries over to the degree to which accreditation will, and perhaps must, give attention to collective bargaining.

As we moved in the discussions from more generalized observations, instances of the interaction between bargaining and accreditation proved numerous. We sensed that discussants did recognize unionism as an important element. However, we noted also that the influence of unionism varied considerably among the various facets of the operation of an institution of interest to accreditors. For some facets bargaining appears to have minimal significance; for others it has major import. Yet, since each facet relates inherently to others and to the totality of a college or university, we felt it necessary to make our analysis inclusive.

To the above end, therefore, this section on analysis will convey the findings of the study using five areas pertinent to regional accreditation. These are listed below. Then, as a sixth area, we will examine the process of accreditation; the role of the regional agency and institutional review. The first five areas are:

Resources–financial, physical plant, equipment, facilities.
Organization–organizational structure, administration.
Personnel administration–appointments, promotions, salary determinations, tenure decisions.
Academic program–instruction, curriculum, scholarship and research.
Student experience–personnel administration, campus life.

Resources

Does a college or university have the fiscal and other resources necessary to carry out properly its stated missions? When it holds a commitment to advanced study, for example, does it have the financial capability for seminar-size classes, support of faculty research, library and/or laboratory facilities, etc.? Or, if committed to technical-vocational programs, can it sustain the laboratories and equipment and specialized instruction necessary to maintain appropriate quality of instruction? The facets of adequate resources are numerous, of course, and encompass the gamut of institutional functions. For this study, the corollary quesiton is: Do or can academic unions bargaining for improved economic and other benefits tend to influence the distribution of those financial resources essential to the institutional mission? If so, does this situation pose a problem for regional accreditation?

The discussions brought into focus several subquestions which tended to reflect the participants' experience with unionism. Throughout, however, the following syllogism proved applicable. Decisions on the distribution of resources affect the carrying out of the mission of an institution. Collective bargaining does have an effect upon the distribution of resources. Therefore, regional accreditation's concern with the implementation of mission necessitates attention to faculty unionism.

The question which most commonly arose was the following. To what extent does collective bargaining cause a redistribution of resources among personnel, library, instruction equipment and supplies, maintenance, security, and other costs? Discussants with more extensive experience with bargaining stressed that a team should treat this question with extreme caution. In their view, bargaining was only one of many factors affecting resource distribution. Moreover, since faculty unionism has accompanied a time of economic recession and financial restraint, its efforts to obtain improved salaries and fringe benefits may appear greater than would have been the case in "normal" times. If salaries now command a greater share of the budget than may suit an administration, this could demonstrate a need for increased institutional support. The point was made that, while the accrediting process may point to serious deficiencies in one or another area of expenditure, it was the responsibility of the institution to meet the deficiency through the various means available to it, and thus not the responsibility of the accrediting agencies to attribute cause.

The contrary posture, maintained by some discussants, was that accrediting bodies do have an obligation to examine causes and thus to relate perceived deficiencies in resource allocation to collective bargaining when in their judgment such a relationship exists. There can be no doubt but that higher salaries, the cost of bargaining itself, and various economic aspects of a given contract can impact an institution's priorities and conceivably its mission. Reductions in discretionary funds, reduced allocations for professional growth, decreased support for library and for instructional support—all of which may parallel the bargaining process—require notice. Increases in the size and costs of the bureaucracy required to prepare for and conduct negotiations and administer the agreement warrant consideration. Illustrations were presented of the reduction in administrative discretionary funds. Changes in compensation for part-time faculty—which reduced the number employable and significantly impacted the institutional mission—were noted. The inclusion of chairmen in the bargaining unit was viewed as leading to an increase in a dean's staff, since faculty evaluation would likely become a function of that office.

Is it the responsibility of the accrediting agency to take into account the possible effects upon future negotiations emerging from the disclosure of institutional finances to the visiting team? This was an especially troublesome question for participants from private colleges and universities where financial data have often been closely guarded by administrators. There was consensus that the accrediting process and the negotiations process should not impact each other through unprofessional use of financial data. Also, the suggestion was made that accrediting bodies may need to differentiate between public and private institutions when dealing with financial questions.

Finally, how should an accrediting body respond to the failure of an institution to implement recommendations of an accrediting visit because of a conflict with a negotiated contract? Discussants recognized this possibility when recommendations affected terms and conditions of employment, especially job security

and tenure. Administrators frequently referred to what they viewed as a loss in organizational flexibility associated with the advent of bargaining. In contrast, spokesmen for faculty unions emphasized the responsibility of the community, the state, and society in general to provide the resources to implement changes.

It was evident that for resource allocation accrediting teams and associations will find it difficult to avoid a consideration of cause as well as effect in their review of the distribution of institutional resources. However, this problem holds for influences other than collective bargaining, although bargaining does tend to bring the question into sharper focus. It creates an additional complication for accreditation within an already complex set of internal relationships which, in total, may enhance or detract from the ability of a college or university to implement its stated mission.

Organization

The significance for accreditation of collective bargaining as it impacted upon campus or institutional organization and administration was complex. In general, discussants agreed that a difference was present and that this difference had importance for regional associations. To begin with, the legal basis for faculty organization, which frequently transcends the authority of governing boards, presents a different circumstance for purposes of institutional evaluation in assessing the effectiveness of administration. Formal equality inherent in negotiations across a bargaining table contrasts with the traditional administration paramountcy on the shaping of policy for terms and conditions of employment, although administrators continue to be responsible for operational decisions. As noted, regional accrediting agencies customarily viewed presidents and administrations as responsible for how well colleges or universities were carrying out their designated missions. They were expected to obtain faculty sentiment, but in a degree and kind left to their volition. With recognized faculty unions, a different relationship exists. Yet, participants were by no means in agreement or even sure about the kinds of differences which occur.

The observations in response to this line of inquiry during the study seminars fall into two categories which will serve as the basis for our comments which follow. One included impact upon the organizational structure of colleges and universities; the other upon the activity of administration.

Structure

Two facets of organizational structure were recognized during the study discussions as bearing especially upon the interaction of regional accreditation and faculty unionism. One, that of the consequences of statewide systems of higher education, was unique to public colleges and universities. A second concerned the role of faculty members in institutional governance.

It was clear to all observers that the trend toward increased centralization of authority accompanying the emergence of statewide and multicampus structures for public colleges and universities carries with it significant implications for regional accreditation. The latter has approached institutions as autonomous entities. Yet, more and more frequently significant decisions which guide campus policy-making and implementation, especially for budget and finance, personnel policies, and educational planning, are made in central headquarters, usually in association with agencies of state governments. This has become manifest as a development with which regional bodies will have to come to grips.

Academic collective bargaining in public higher education has tended to parallel centralized structures. Campuses are organized for collective bargaining on a system-wide basis, and negotiations are conducted either with central administrations or representatives of the state governments themselves. This arrangement generally has had the support of state public employment relations boards which determine the scope of bargaining units. On the union side, it parallels and at times aligns itself with state teachers associations.

The seminars focused upon the following question. Does the existence of faculty collective bargaining suggest the need for a change in accreditation evaluation criteria and process for multi-unit systems under a single agreement? Discussants were uncertain. The general sentiment was phrased by one participant as follows: "Collective bargaining is bringing out into the open in a much clearer way aspects of relationships (in statewide systems) that accreditation teams should be aware of, but which were rather muted in the past."

Uniformly, discussants recognized that statewide and multicampus systems have created new conditions for regional accreditation. The problem this poses remains unresolved in their view, although examples of attempts to come to grips with the change were presented. Union representatives recognized that confusion did exist in some states regarding at what point and in what manner final decisions are made. Unions, one individual noted further, will go to the legislature if that is where the decisions are made. He suggested, also, that accreditation will have to recognize the role of state governments.

Additionally, a question arose about the impact of a system-wide negotiated agreement on an accreditation process based upon individual campuses. Some participants saw no major problems in this area. Others intimated that at times system-wide agreements were used by local administrators to avoid responsibility for difficult decisions. Most discussants stated that accreditation had a value for individual campuses. Campuses benefited from the symbol of accreditation approval. Discussants were not sure that system-wide contracts enervated the influence of local administrators and faculties. It was observed, however, that a multicampus or system contract would not be completely compatible with the unique interests and mission of individual campuses.

Is faculty participation in decision-making relevant for the evaluation of an institution by accrediting agencies? Some discussants responded in the negative, noting, as one individual stated, "Accreditation should be concerned only with

the administration getting the appropriate kind of professional advice, and that doesn't even have to come from the college's own faculty." However, a strong sentiment supported the view that in practice accrediting teams place value upon formal faculty involvement and in the existence of effective faculty governing bodies, such as senates. We concluded as observers that accreditation tends to support many values associated with major universities and that the existence in these institutions of strong faculty governance systems did carry over into evaluations of the four-year and two-year colleges.

Does academic collective bargaining alter the nature of faculty participation in a manner important for accreditation? The discussions for this study, and observations in another study conducted concurrently[2], conveyed the impression that it has or it has the potential to do so. In general, unions exhibit varying approaches. At times they seek, especially in two-year colleges, a contractual delineation of faculty rights and prerogatives covering a variety of specific details. They generally strive to obtain in contracts a recognition, or confirmation, of faculty roles in departments and memberships on important committees and on elected faculty senates or councils. Where a well-established and accepted governance system exists, they tend to view the existing situation as a given, at times making reference in the agreement to published trustee policies. In some institutions the union membership includes a sufficiently large majority of the faculty that the distinction between union organization and faculty governance bodies becomes a structural one solely; the same individuals have assumed leadership roles in both. Discussants recognized that unionization does tend to sharpen role differences between faculty and administrators. Negotiated contracts, it was noted, tend to make more formal, and consequently more distinct, the managerial responsibilities of presidents and administrators.

Out of considerations such as these emerge a number of further questions. One which came up frequently was whether or not governance of itself was a proper area of accreditation concern. Should not accreditation center its attention on goals and the effectiveness of an institution in reaching them rather than on organizational means? With few exceptions, representatives of the regional associations confirmed our sense that faculty input into decisions affecting academic policies was a matter of concern to accrediting teams.

If faculty participation in governance is a proper and important area of concern to an accrediting association, the question then arises as to whether the impact of collective bargaining upon governance should be assessed. On the basis that this participation related to the quality of the educational programs, most discussants favored giving the matter attention but indicated that it should be approached with caution. It was recognized that collective bargaining did provide the potential for significant alternative means for the expression of faculty sentiments. As one representative of a national faculty association pointed out,

[2]E. D. Duryea, *Collective Bargaining: Impact on Governance* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1977).

governance was an important concern for collective bargaining and also must be for accreditation. The uncertainty which did emerge had to do with whether collective bargaining tended to push accreditation more completely into administrative hands and thus make it of lesser or no concern to faculty members. Nonetheless, we did sense a consensus supporting the need for accrediting teams to be aware of the quality of relationship between administrators and a faculty union as a factor affecting the quality of an institution's ability to carry out its mission.

A further question related to participation in governance had to do with whether accreditation should be concerned with the impact of collective bargaining upon the role and functions of governing boards. While the existence of a legally-binding contract negotiated with faculty representatives does imply restrictions upon board authority, discussants doubted that in practice this had a significant impact for accreditation. As one regional association officer observed, boards are viewed as only one segment of an institution. In general, this question did not elicit in the seminars a sense of serious concern. Most discussants appeared to feel that the extent to which collective bargaining affects the ability of a board to maintain its traditional authority was not an urgent area of concern for accreditation.

Finally, in the discussants' assessment of organizational structure some attention was given to the role of departments under collective bargaining. It certainly appeared that the quality of departments warranted recognition in the evaluation report. Does the inclusion of chairmen in a bargaining unit, therefore, raise an important issue for accredition? This did not prove to be a matter of significance in the several seminars. When touched upon, there was agreement that a correlation should exist between the capacity of a department to contribute to the institutional mission and its chairman. Some discussants suggested that an accrediting team may "be troubled" by changes brought about by collective bargaining in this regard, implying at least a weakening of administrative leadership at that level. On the other hand, union representatives objected to this assumption, stating that a change in the role of a chairman does not necessarily lead to a loss in departmental effectiveness.

Administration

The ability of the president and his administrative staff to support the mission of the institution through the cultivation of good faculty morale, teaching and scholarly effectiveness, financial viability, and similar matters was accepted as a major area for accreditation purposes. As indicated, unionism creates a significant new dimension for administration. Administrators, through representatives at a bargaining table, must discuss and negotiate matters related to terms and conditions of employment, frequently quite broadly conceived. The ensuring agreement stipulates policies and procedures which previously required at least final approval by a president. Interpersonal relations between union

leaders and administrators typically become far more critical than those with representatives of faculty government bodies established by presidential/trustee mandate or permission. Faculty members who feel that they have been treated unfairly may have to resort to formal grievance procedures, designed to protect due process in personnel decisions, which may ultimately go to an external arbitrator. Unions have the support of strong national associations and the ability to turn to the NLRB or state employment boards and the courts in disputes with the administration. In sum, administrators find it necessary to act with far more caution in relations with faculties, and these relationships tend to become more formalized. In this sense, unionism adds to the complexity of administration.

As in other aspects of the study, discussants uniformly recognized that a unionized campus presents for accreditation a new and different adminstrative environment. And like discussions of other topics, the reaction to specific facets of impact upon campus administration proved mixed. Discussants did identify, however, several questions.

Should an accrediting team anticipate changes in the role of presidents under collective bargaining that have implications for review by visitation teams? As might be expected, administrators in the seminars tended to stress constrictions upon the ability of presidents and administrators to exercise effective leadership. Faculty members, especially those affiliated with unions, were not so sure. It was noted that a union contract, as a rule, made administrative relationships much more precise and, in turn, the presidential role more definite. The point also was made that unionism could strengthen the position of this officer, restricting it only with reference to appropriate recognition of faculty interests and of due process in judgments made upon their service. In retrospect, we sense that the balance between administrative control and union impact upon this control was idiosyncratic to individual institutions, reflective of the existence of a strong or weak union and of conditions which led to unionization. Even though an accreditation association views presidents as primarily responsible for institutional leadership, it will be difficult for evaluation teams to ignore the role and impact of unions, either during their campus visits or in the chairmen's reports.

Should an accrediting team recognize and concern itself with the institutional problems created by the presence of several unions—those for nonprofessional and support personnel as well as for faculty members? On many campuses administrators now negotiate with from two or three to more than a dozen unions. The potential exists for work stoppages or job actions by one union which can cause reactions among others. A condition in one contract, such as stipulated holidays, classroom availability, parking privileges, etc., may prove contrary to the interests of members of other unions. Administrators brought in to negotiate with a number of unions and to handle contract administration at times lack experience and understanding of the academic needs of a college or university including faculty attitudes, due process, and academic freedom. To a

lesser or greater degree, criteria of concern for accreditation were seen as affected by situations such as these.

Do the consequences of competition among unions for faculty representation raise concerns for accreditation? During our initial site visits, we did observe campuses politicized by such competition. On one campus, for example, the accrediting visit had to be postponed until an election was held and a contract negotiated. On this campus, and at another visited, the chosen agent held a slim majority, which meant that union negotiators felt a pressure to prove their ability to gain substantial benefits for membership, independent of other considerations. Furthermore, such competition has the effect of presenting to visiting teams a somewhat confused picture of morale and of faculty perceptions of administrative effectiveness. In general, discussants recognized the problem inherent in this kind of situation as one of many factors likely to enter the accreditation process, but felt that it was exceptional rather than usual.

Finally, a more general question was given attention. Should accrediting teams explore the impact of collective bargaining upon the decision-making processes of a campus? If so, it is hard to conceive of the bargaining phenomenon failing to provide considerations for a team's attention. Most discussants associated with unions judged that bargaining can provide a role for faculty in institutional decision-making where one currently does not exist. It has the potential to secure a greater faculty sense of responsibility for the institution, and thus for the process of accreditation and the implementation of its recommendations. These discussants stressed that unions can contribute to improved morale, important to administration, by achieving more equitable work loads and compensation. A more systematic approach to personnel affairs will enhance administrative effectiveness. An adversarial stance need not mean an antagonistic one and can assure a fair representation of the interests of both sides. Unionism can bring about a more appropriate balance within an institution, consistent with sound administration.

In contrast, discussants with an administrative orientation proved less inclined to subscribe to the positive contributions of collective bargaining. They referred, as previously indicated, to what they perceived as problems or difficulties faculty unionism created for their ability to make decisions and carry out policies important for institutional well-being. From their perspective unionism made their work more bureaucratic or formal and more complex. It was not only the actual provisions of an agreement, they reiterated, but the need to anticipate interpretations of the contract which related to administrative actions. They presented examples of difficulties in handling promotions and tenure awards with a view to merit and to institutional need under the duress of assuring appropriate due process consistent with the agreement; they suggested that in some instances procedural requirements overshadowed substantive judgments in personnel actions. They noted instances of handling grievance cases with more anticipation of the outcome in arbitration and of the precedents set than of the intrinsic merit of the cases themselves. They maintained that at times

a faculty was obsessed more with prerogatives than with appropriate distribution of authority.

All of these foregoing considerations which entered into the discussions, despite conflicting judgments about them, were held as matters of interest for accreditation evaluation. Yet, discussants did not sense that the specific facets of union-management relations would likely receive, or should receive, explicit attention during a team visit. Rather, a sensitivity to them would assist those involved in accreditation to understand more clearly the problems of a unionized campus. What could arise, as one individual observed, was a role for accreditation in serving "as a brake upon excesses by either side." Furthermore, as developed in one session for the study, accrediting teams must recognize these conditions so that the chairman's report does not inadvertently serve either union or management as a means of gaining an end not achieved at the bargaining table. Our sense of the discussion is that, one way or the other, regional accrediting agencies and visiting teams will find it difficult in practice to keep separate the relationships associated with collective bargaining from the substance of an accreditation review.

Academic Programs

The quality of instruction, curriculum, and scholarship or research as the central missions of a college or university constitute a primary interest to regional accreditation. In contrast, collective bargaining by definition covers terms and conditions of employment. As a consequence, negotiations and agreements do not address the academic program. Yet it has to be recognized that in practice the line of demarcation is by no means so clear. Compensation and fringe benefits, instructional load and related responsibilities, right of appeal for grievances, and similar conditions of employment presumably affect how well the academic program is carried out. The quality of morale relates to the enthusiasm and commitment which faculty members give to their services. Furthermore, policies and practices concerned with promotion and tenure, appointments, instructional assignments, changes in programs and degree requirements, programmatic innovations, criteria for evaluation of service, and similar matters all have consequences for the security and working conditions of faculty members. Thus, the interests of accrediting bodies and those of faculty unions do exhibit a degree of congruence in the view of discussants for the study.

As could be anticipated, the interests of accrediting bodies and of unions intersected for academic matters on issues related to merit review and tenure or job security associated with changes in educational programs, and, in this latter regard, to actions on retrenchment. These are tangential rather than explicit for academic affairs. In discussions of these matters, a number of considerations received attention.

Will accrediting teams and regional associations support a distinction between tenure and job security? To what extent does the former reflect an acceptance into a disciplinary or professional specialization as judged by peers? To what extent is it recognition of years of satisfactory performance? Once again, practice and union attitudes vary according to an institution and its type. Some discussants stressed that union preoccupation with job security is not prompted by concern for time in service but by an effort to assure equitable and fair treatment. The question is sharpened considerably for accreditation when a negotiated contract reinforces seniority as the major criterion for reappointment or promotion. Discussants emphasized that accrediting agencies look to conditions which might impinge upon instructional quality and appropriate programming. During the study discussions, instances were referred to which illustrated difficulties for administrators striving to adjust programs to changing student and community needs under contracts which protected faculty job security. There was no consensus, however, regarding the extent to which the impact of collective bargaining upon academic affairs should receive particular attention in the accreditation process.

Closely associated with the above, the query arose as to whether accrediting agencies need give attention to merit and its interpretation where collective bargaining is present. The usual response was that they should if "the quality of the institution is affected." There was less consensus on what constitutes "quality" and the nature of "affect," however. Discussants associated with unions stressed what they termed "fair and equitable" process and criteria. Administrators evidenced concern with improvement in faculty competence. One senses in this issue the underlying difficulty that "merit" escapes clear definition. Since unionism in general is proving a force for a greater clarification of criteria and process in personnel relations, we judge from the discussions that accrediting agencies may have to clarify their definition of this term if they view it as a significant consideration.

Will accrediting teams find it appropriate to examine the relationship of unionism to academic innovation? The point was made in the discussions that unions have a commitment to an existing constituency, one whose interests are bound to the status quo. Innovation usually requires programmatic change, or new areas of study and degrees, or frequently a different clientele, or perhaps a shift to a greater emphasis upon scholarship and research. Such change, in turn, alters the responsibilities of existing faculty and may indeed lead to the termination of some individuals and, concurrently, the employment of new staff. Accreditation presumably supports appropriate innovation which sustains the effectiveness of a college or university. Administrators in the seminars tended to feel that collective bargaining impedes an appropriate response to the accreditation interest in institutional quality. Participants associated with unions disagreed, of course. The question met with the kinds of emotional and value-oriented responses that make rational assessment difficult. What discussants did agree to, however, was that in practice accrediting teams are more inclined to observe

deficiencies and weaknesses than to point up causes and solutions, so that union-administration relations on change remain an intra-institutional matter.

Personnel

It was generally conceded that collective bargaining has had a major influence upon the process for the handling of appointments, promotions, salary determinations, and tenure. Union stress upon clear and open criteria, due process, and formal procedures for handling grievances has led to a clarification of criteria for personnel decisions. The result, as intimated earlier, has been a greater ordering of personnel procedures, a clearer identification of the appropriate contents for personnel files, a more ready access for the individual to his file, and other actions which have tended to improve the management of institutions. In this sense, collective bargaining has been supportive of the interest of accrediting teams and has tended to assure them of more complete and better organized data.

The question did arise whether accrediting agencies should investigate bargained contracts to determine the impact of "due process" clauses upon the capacity of institutions to exercise proper evaluation of faculty members. This relates to an accreditation emphasis on improvement in the quality of faculty members. As noted in our preceding discussion, administrators stressed what they perceived as a conflict between job security and instructional quality. They saw themselves burdened with the need to prove incompetence rather than to screen for the best available candidate, within or without the institution. Faculty members, in turn, spoke of the importance of due process and fair and open criteria for morale and academic quality. However, most discussants concurred with the position that contracts which provide for early tenure and do not insure review of academic competence should be of concern to an accrediting team. One regional director did indicate that his association took no position on the matter of tenure.

Do contractual policies on procedures for the award of salary increases and promotion affect accreditation concepts of institutional quality? The discussions of this matter paralleled generally those on tenure. Sentiments in support of clear criteria and due process conflicted with those concerned with administrative stress on the selection of the most competent. Administrators viewed the former as restrictions upon selectivity; faculty members evidenced distrust of administrative judgments and saw no conflict with the quality of instruction and scholarship. As in the discussions of tenure, participants evidenced little congruence on the posture most appropriate for accreditation.

Another question which received attention in the area of personnel was whether or not compulsory arbitration, as a final step in the grievance process, constitutes a matter of concern for accreditation. Most discussants accepted compulsory arbitration as an inevitable concomitant of collective bargaining.

They recognized that arbitration reviews procedural rather than substantive judgments where the distinction may be blurred at times, such as, for example, recognizing the importance of peer judgment for assessing the quality of research productivity. Some concern was expressed with the fact that arbitration removed such decisions from institutional bodies and placed them in the hands of individuals who frequently lacked a background in academic affairs. We did not sense from the seminars, however, that this constitutes a matter of immediate concern for regional accreditation.

Student Experience

It has been our observation and the comment of other observers of collective bargaining that college and university students have been little, if at all, involved in the bargaining process (except in varying degree in three states by statute), and that they are very infrequently mentioned in bargained contracts. Thus, it came as no surprise in our site visits and in the seminars that there was almost no mention of student concerns in whatever relationships may exist between collective bargaining by faculty members and regional accreditation. Student participation in the bargaining process is non-existent except in a very few situations where state law provides a role. But even in this latter situation the student role tends to be somewhat nominal.

Discussions revealed little to offset the general impression that accreditation, in turn, examines colleges and universities through contacts with administrators, faculty members, and, to a lesser degree, trustees. While student input is sought during the accreditation visit, this effort was not reflected in the discussions. It was recognized, however, that the kind of educational and campus experience provided for students did have significance for accreditation. Visiting teams certainly look at the administration of student personnel services.

Student life and educational experience do not present an area in which accreditation and collective bargaining so far have come together. The possible exception may appear in graduate education should graduate and teaching assistants turn to collective bargaining in a significant manner.

Accreditation Process

Discussions about the process of evaluating an institution—not unlike those about the substantive areas of accreditation—demonstrated a consensus about the significance of collective bargaining as a new force but uncertainty about its impact in specific situations and relevance to accreditation. Furthermore, discussants evidenced a similar uncertainty about whether visiting teams should give it even discrete attention. Some viewed unionism as one facet of a complex of activities which influenced institutional attainment of mission. A typical comment in support of this position was that, ". . . Unionism is simply a part of

process." On the other hand, as will become evident in the discussion which follows, it proved difficult for discussants to assess specific aspects of process without assessing the impact of unionism.

To convey a sense of our findings, we have chosen to structure this part of the report into three subsections: (1) preparation for the accrediting visit, including the role of regional agencies; (2) the visit itself; and (3) the report of an institution finally submitted.

Preparation

Should there be any need for special attention to the acceptability of an accreditation visit to a given campus? We found little evidence to the contrary. We were told of an instance in the Midwest where a board of trustees has refused to grant a regional accrediting body entree to its campus, apparently because of the board's belief that the faculty union and the visiting team might collaborate to the benefit to the faculty. Reference was made to the development of some resistance to accreditation among trustees of other institutions in the same category of institutions elsewhere in that state because of similar concerns. Since no mention of this was made within any of the other groups, we can assume that the matter is of no great significance at present.

Will there be any problems associated with a perceived bias of a given team chairman or its membership? The discussions revealed little apprehension about possible bias by chairmen, generally because it was assumed these would be persons of previously demonstrated stature who recognized the need for objectivity. But substantial discussions were aroused over the regional body's criteria for selecting team members. For the most part the discussions can be summarized by stating that both management and union-oriented participants favored team members who had been drawn from unionized campuses for the evaluation of a campus where bargaining exists. One reference was made to a campus union which succeeded in obtaining a change in team membership to provide for one more acceptable. The statement of one seminar participant, speaking from a union point of view, summed up the feelings of many: "It is important that accreditation teams have representatives who are cognizant of the consequences of collective bargaining and who understand it. In the past there have been instances of team members totally in another world as far as collective bargaining is concerned and were (sic) entirely critical because they did not understand it." Campus administrators present stated at least equal interest.

The discussions pointed to a special need in the case of public colleges and universities; that is, team members should be familiar with the statutes unique to the particular state where the campus is located. One proposal examined at each seminar was that of including an individual on each team who could be viewed as an expert in collective bargaining in that state. This is the policy of at least one association in which a team member may be asked to enroll in an in-service program sponsored by the association.

As the executive director of one regional association said, collective bargaining had created "a real problem in making up the teams." Whether the problem is political or emerges from a concern for a comprehensive and objective report was not disclosed. As noted, however, regional associations appear to recognize the growing significance of team composition from both a union and management perspective.

Should there be special preparation of all team members for an evaluation visit to a unionized campus? It was clear among all discussants, as well as during our previous site visits, that one consideration was imperative; namely, along with other materials, each team member should receive and read a copy of the contract prior to the visit.

Inasmuch as there may be considerable variation in contracts for a variety of reasons—institutional differences, public/private considerations, campus leadership and morale, etc.—one question we raised was the possible need for regional staffs to monitor the contracts signed in their regions. We also asked if regional staffs should review the various applicable statutes and policies and regulations of the NLRB and state employee relations boards. This was viewed by all groups as not operationally feasible.

Will collective bargaining affect the timing of a given visit to campus? The response generally was in the affirmative. Visitation schedules must accommodate the calendar for union-management negotiating. We have noted the situation at one campus at which the team visit had to be postponed one year because of a union-management hiatus. (The contract eventually was signed just a few weeks before the visit.) The presence of non-faculty unions on a campus may also complicate visitation schedules. For example, if a near-strike, an actual strike, or some other tension led to non-faculty picket lines, several discussants wondered if team members would enter the campus.

Where does the basic responsibility for preparation of the self-study, normally required in accreditation visits, lie on a unionized campus? There was general agreement among regional associations that the self-study was normally initiated by the administration with, hopefully, broad faculty participation. Yet most discussants anticipated that increasingly unions will wish a more formal role in the preparation, possibly to devote a chapter to themselves. In the final analysis, there seemed rather general agreement that under unionism—unless a strong governance system existed—the self-study would become more and more the province of management, which was viewed as having the most to gain (or lose) from a visit. As one individual commented, "Administrations are more eager for a favorable evaluation because the results hit them first. The faculty have less at stake as individuals."

In contrast, our own observation is that the presence of a strong union on campus could change this perception, particularly if the union should view governance as within its realm. We observed this clearly in one of the site visits where the union was becoming the primary vehicle for expression of faculty opinion. Our judgment was confirmed in the discussions with national union

leaders who, as stated earlier, showed distinct interest in accreditation standards. We anticipate that on the individual campus where historically the faculty is involved in governance to the satisfaction of the union, there may be no change in the preparation of the self-study. Nevertheless, several union-oriented discussants stressed the importance of faculty input to the self-study. Whether by contractual agreement or simply the force of union influence, more direct impact upon the self-study and other aspects of the preparation likely will emerge from the presence of the bargaining unit.

The determination of the need for an accreditation visit and the locus of responsibility for planning the schedule of meetings require a certain initiative. Should decisions such as these lie with the administration? From the associations' point of view this is an institutional matter, as contrasted with an administrative decision; however, normal procedure would call for the associations to communicate with the administration of a campus about all matters related to accreditation, including the planning. This concurred with the judgment of faculty discussants that typically "institutional" meant "administrative." As an indication of what may become more common, one faculty member stated that the union on his campus had insisted on an accreditation visit in the face of what was interpreted as administrative delays.

Conduct of Visits

Next we must ask, what hazards, if any, does unionization create for the objectivity of an accrediting visit? The seminars revealed several.

It should be expected that in a major academic union-management struggle each side will use the content and emphasis of the accrediting report where helpful to its particular needs. Several comments by discussants pointed to this possibility. One said: ". . . To think that you can go into an institution and make judgments on quality which are not going to affect the bargaining process is terribly naive." It is especially important, said another, ". . . To avoid being used by either the union or the administration in order to influence what occurs at the bargaining table."

Will the conduct and judgments of a visiting team unaware of relatively normal activities associated with union-management relationships be affected? Are they likely to relate grievances inappropriately with faculty morale? Will they find themselves involved with pressures from competing unions? Will a different style of faculty-administration relationships accompanying unionism affect their judgments on organizational effectiveness? Conditions such as these may have little bearing upon the normal criteria for accreditation, yet they could be viewed by team members inexperienced with collective bargaining in a negative manner. This possibility was noted during the seminars. Union-oriented participants, especially, stressed the importance that accrediting activities be conducted so as to recognize that collective bargaining likely will alter many of the norms

of previous years, yet it need not impact negatively upon institutional morale and constructive organizational relations. In other words, a visiting team should understand that unionism might lead to a change in the manner of administrative-faculty actions, but these should not be conceived as thereby leading to problems which elicit in turn problems for accreditation.

There was, also, mention of problems inherent in the accreditation of a single public institution within a statewide system subject to the terms of a statewide union contract. Should a team be critical of outcomes beyond the control of such a campus? Can a visiting team permit its perceptions and conclusions to be influenced by the fact that a campus may not be its own master? Questions such as these led to inconclusive discussions about the desirability or need for accreditation to become a statewide process which will review concurrently all the institutions included within a given system and with one contract.

Does the presence of a faculty union dictate formal consultation between the team and the union leadership? Or should the team view its approach to be through the faculty as such? The response to this question, as mentioned in an earlier section, may be qualified by the existence of a strong faculty governance system, one either independent of the union or carrying its sanction. There was comment that consultations with union leadership inevitably will involve team members in a sensitive area from the point of view of the administration. Also, team members will need to be mindful of the interests of non-union faculty members and of those who belong to competing organizations. Nevertheless, several discussants recognized sound reasons for formal team communication with the union leadership, especially in efforts to evaluate the adequacy of the self-study report and to gain a sense of faculty-administrative relationships.

Will visitation teams encounter unique circumstances on unionized campuses? Most institutions are subject to a sequence of rise and fall in overall morale. There was general agreement that collective bargaining has an effect upon this sequence. As one individual noted, "Campus moods swing more dramatically with unionism." There are periods during negotiations when faculty dissatisfaction becomes most manifest. Following the signing of a contract, a "honeymoon" may exist. Our discussants stated that visiting teams need to be conscious of these swings when they assay relationships. We already have referred to the need to consider them in scheduling visits. At times competing unions may politicize a campus sufficiently to make, as one discussant pointed out, "objective evaluation difficult." Team members who have reached a certain level of maturity in union practices, according to the discussion at another seminar, will understand these changes and take them into account in their evaluation process.

As mentioned earlier, the style of administrative-faculty relationships may well change under unionism to become "adversarial." Indeed, the nature of collective bargaining dictates it. But the point was carefully made by experienced management and union-oriented discussants that "adversarial" need not mean "antagonistic." It was our observation that discussants coming from that portion

of the country with the most experience in bargaining were the most relaxed about unionism and its impact upon accrediting.

Should the team give specific consideration to the management-union contract? We have stated that it should be part of the materials sent to the team in advance of the visit. Members of one seminar insisted that the team could not ignore the contract any more than it would the faculty manual. As we have said, the contract relates critically to the personnel policies and procedures of an institution. Nonetheless, discussants were agreed for the most part that the team, as one participant stressed, "Should not make judgments about the contract itself; rather it should examine and discuss how it may or may not impinge upon accreditation standards." This may imply alteration of accreditation norms in a particular situation if a fundamental conflict is obvious.

However, in contrast, and as stated earlier, there was minority opinion to the effect that the team should point to provisions of the contract which were in conflict with accreditation norms and conceivably, recommend withholding accreditation until remedial action was taken. In fact, one discussant felt strongly that failure to take cognizance of the contract might lead to legal action on grounds of an incomplete evaluation.

Finally, we might ask how unionism would effect the team chairman's exit interview. There was little discussion of this in the seminars. Apparently, the format differs widely among institutions. Some evidence suggested that on campuses with strong unions, representatives of the union were present at the interview. This fact was viewed by one discussant as likely to alter the substance of the chairman's oral report.

Will the presence of faculty collective bargaining require recognition in the substance of the report? Discussants did not view this question as a particularly critical one. The report was the product of a team visit prepared by a chairman afterwards to communicate findings. It cannot be intentionally altered to reflect the reactions which might be anticipated in terms of union or management interests. In fact, the seminars elicited very little comment in this connection or additional to the generalizations, noted above, with regard to the distribution and use of the report.

The limited attention given to the report during this study, however, does not remove from our view the fact that it does constitute an aspect of accreditation likely to become involved in union relationships. One can anticipate, for example, vigorous union opposition to a report advocating programmatic changes which impinge upon job security or which implies a lack of appropriate quality in certain instructional activities. Such opposition could raise questions regarding the validity of the accreditation process itself, not unlike opposition to a team visit on the part of a governing board which we noted previously. However, such speculation does not have a basis in the discussion for this study.

In summary, we observed during the discussions a general agreement that the existence of faculty unions had implications for much of the visitation process. Collective bargaining does appear to alter the milieu of a campus and

the quality and style of faculty-administration relationships. In line with other facets of this report, however, we have to observe that as discussions shifted to the more specific facets of a team visit the unanimity was by no means so complete. The import of unionism very well can be overstressed. As visiting teams increasingly include members familiar with, and to a degree sophisticated about, collective bargaining, they likely will view it as a more normal condition and find it less distracting from their primary interest in institutional quality and achievement of missions. As one participant noted, in a vein similar to many others, "Accreditation is concerned with outcomes. That is the focus for a visiting team. It must evaluate institutional quality not institutional process. Unionism is simply a part of process."

Nevertheless, we sensed that one cannot totally separate outcomes from process and thus from collective bargaining on a campus.

CONCLUSIONS

Reflecting upon the discussions conducted for the study and the foregoing analysis, we find it appropriate in our concluding observations to reiterate the need for caution in assessing the impact of collective bargaining upon regional accreditation. As a new and certainly dynamic force, faculty unionism, where it exists, poses a different set of relationships for regional accreditation and higher education. To date, unionism has affected the two-year public colleges and, to a lesser degree, the four-year colleges and universities. We anticipate that it will spread to a far greater segment of higher education; but this remains conjecture. Furthermore, we recognize that we have examined a single aspect of the complex of activities which constitute the operation of a college or university and, in doing so, may accentuate its significance. Collective bargaining constitutes one of a number of forces which exercise influence, to a lesser or greater degree, upon accreditation.

Nonetheless, our investigations and the discussion conducted for this report support the judgment that academic collective bargaining has become a force in higher education to which regional accrediting agencies will need to give serious attention. Our study has made clear, also, that faculty unionism lacks a sufficient history from which to generate data necessary for extensive recommendations with great confidence. Throughout our dicsussions, this was illustrated by the fact that participants tended to turn their attention to the impact of unionism upon internal relationships. Very few discussants had thought about it in terms of relationships involved in accrediting reviews, a natural enough situation since reviews of the type involving a team visit normally come only at ten year intervals, and since academic collective bargaining has been a significant factor for only a decade.

Implications

The above situation, therefore, limits the conclusions which we can properly draw from this study. What we will do, as a consequence, is to highlight a number of implications which we present as concerns for regional accreditation. We note them as matters for further review, for deliberation, and for possible policy revision.

1. Throughout the study we encountered what might be called a mixed response to the interaction of faculty unionism and regional accreditation. A clear majority opinion stressed that accreditation has a primary, if not total, concern with definition of mission and with assessing outcomes. From this perspective, unionism constitutes only an additional facet of a campus milieu and a matter for administrators and faculty members to resolve as a local situation requires. Yet, when conversations turned to the various specific areas to which accreditation must give attention, unionism emerged consistently as a force which did influence policies and practices. On many campuses, especially those with strong unions, visiting teams faced situations significantly different from those at non-unionized institutions.

Of basic and certainly initial importance, therefore, is whether or not accrediting agencies can limit their review solely to achievement of mission or must include causes. While collective bargaining is but one of a number of new forces at work within higher education (such as state financial controls, statewide coordination and systematization, affirmative action, and economic recession), we submit that it will have a major importance for an increasing number of colleges and universities. Accrediting agencies will find it necessary to give it discrete attention and, in doing so, consider implications such as those which we raise in this concluding section.

2. A correlative of the foregoing point arises when one considers the nature of accreditation and of unionism. The former serves the public interest through private rather than governmental agencies. Although given a degree of legal sanction in practice (as, for instance, federal agencies rely upon accredited status as one of the bases for financial support), accrediting agencies are voluntary professional associations. Unions also may be viewed as voluntary and serve a clientele, the constituency of a bargaining unit, to protect their private and professional interests as employees. But they exist with the support of legal sanctions in terms of state and federal legislation interpreted by semi-judicial bodies, employee relations boards.

The question for review derivative of this situation is whether there is or can be a conflict of interests which will need clarification and, at the very least, delineation and consultation between the two activities. As a specific instance, we urge that accrediting bodies consider their potential service as agencies to exert appropriate discipline when they perceive the activities of one side or the other, or possibly both, in conflict with educational concerns associated with the public interest, especially that of students. If they do, then visiting teams and accrediting commissions will have to consider their ability to do so effectively, considering the legal basis for collective bargaining.

3. Following from the above, one can anticipate the real possibility that faculty associations at local, state, and national levels may view accreditation as having been essentially an administrative function supporting policies and practices which may impede how well unions support their constituencies. From their view, unions serve a lawfully sanctioned "public interest" in their own

right. They have a legal obligation to support the welfare of faculty members. Thus, one can anticipate also that unions may find the policies and practices of accreditation directly related to their interests and a matter in which they deserve some voice. This suggests that accrediting agencies should consider the possibility of commencing formal communication with union leadership on a state, regional, or national basis.

4. One of the uncertainties apparent in the study discussions bore upon the role of faculty members in the accreditation process. Is accreditation a responsibility of administration; i.e., the president? Are faculty involvements in the self-study, in discussions with visiting teams, and in the review of the report matters for administrative determination? What is the proper posture of regional accreditation toward the campus approach to evaluation? Some discussants viewed accreditation as an administrative effort, provided that it had appropriate academic input from within or outside an institution. Others viewed faculty involvement essential. Following this line of inquiry, some perceived collective bargaining as a force pushing accreditation further into the area of purely administrative responsibility, while others saw in it pressures for assuring that faculty members played a significant role.

We sense that this question transcends collective bargaining. Regional agencies may wish to examine faculty-administrative roles in accreditation for all institutions, unionized, and non-unionized. However, collective bargaining has sharpened the issue as it relates to the broader area of the accreditation stance upon faculty participation in institutional governance. It raises the question whether faculty serve as employees with professional expertise or as professionals whose services necessitate an influential voice in determining institutional policies and practices which affect them. We would submit that this question warrants formal review in the councils of regional accreditation.

5. At the outset of this report we noted the thrust in public higher education toward statewide systems of institutions under a central control or coordinating board and subject to a greater or lesser degree of centralized administration. We judge that the future will see a continued trend toward consolidated systems of state colleges and of university campuses under a central administrative officer, usually a chancellor, and staff. We judge also that this will expedite a much closer scrutiny of public higher education by agencies of state governments. Accompanying this centralization have been unit determination decisions by state employment relations boards which place the various campuses together in one bargaining unit.

As all our discussants recognized, accreditaiton traditionally has concentrated its attention on individual campuses, although in recent years some experimentation with review of systems as a whole also has taken place.

Unionism by faculty members, therefore, augments an existing problem, bringing into it a new set of forces. Statewide unions, for example, tend to use political pressures upon what they view as the source of power, the governor and legislature, and to do this in collaboration with other unions, especially those for

teachers. Contracts are developed at a central level, at times removed from the problems and needs of individual campuses. One bargaining unit, as in New York, combines diverse institutions, ranging from two-year technical colleges to major university centers, and includes non-teaching professional employees and faculty.

Our point, therefore, is that regional accrediting bodies will have to come to grips with the unique difficulties presented by statewide systems of higher education. As they do so, they must also review how academic collective bargaining contributes to what they observe.

6. One fundamental aspect of collective bargaining is the grievance process. It appears uniformly in negotiated contracts as a means for attempting to assure faculty members fair and equitable treatment and due process in personnel decisions. In general, the grievance process terminates, as the point of final appeal, in review and judgment by an arbitrator external to the institution. Only a few exceptions to this exist, according to our information. In this connection our judgment is quite tentative. However, we do feel that accrediting agencies have a sufficient interest in personnel procedures and their implications for institutional quality to have a concern about a negotiated grievance process which leads to a decision made external to the institution itself and frequently to the academic environment. We raise this as a point for further thought and exploration.

7. The composition of the visiting team has always received careful attention from accrediting commissions and institutional administrators. Campus faculty members have had relatively minor involvement or influence in the selection process. With the entry of a strong "third force" in the form of a union, we propose that regional accrediting commissions will need to review policies for team selection. We have noted that at times chairmen, typically administrators, have evidenced negative judgments on collective bargaining, just as faculty members who are members of unions have evidenced the reverse judgment. We suspect that administrators and union leaders in the future will scrutinize team members carefully in terms of postures toward unionism and that this well may lead—as it actually did in one instance—to challenges about the neutrality of a visiting team. We cannot avoid the conclusion that it represents a situation to which accrediting bodies will have to give serious attention.

8. We noted in the discussions a tendency to view governing boards as only one facet of institutional administration. In contrast, we suggest that boards hold a special significance because of their role as the final legal authority. In the last analysis, they must support implementation of accrediting recommendations and approve policies and expenditures necessary to maintain institutional quality in terms of accrediting expectations. Yet, it appears clear to us that trustee role and functions will be affected by collective bargaining. We hesitate to make specific proposals, but we do submit this as a significant question for accrediting commissions.

9. One critical aspect of collective bargaining from the point of view of administrators pertains to the role of department chairmen. In many instances, unit determination decisions have placed them within the union. As such, discussants noted that they become spokesmen for colleagues rather than agents for administration, a factor of less consequence for major universities but of administrative importance in two-year and many four-year colleges. Does this change alter the kind of decision-making authority viewed as a norm by most visiting teams? Does it alter expectations for administrative leadership on the part of presidents and deans? And thus, does it post changes of significance for accreditation? Based upon the study discussions, we are not sure but note it here as another factor for consideration.

There were other matters which emerged from the discussions of our site visits to which we might address ourselves. The orientation of team members for a visit to a unionized campus; the impact of unionism upon the timing of some visits; the possibility of conflict between institutional flexibility and union concern for job security; the quality and extent of impact of unionism upon administrative responsibility for institutional mission; each of these we have touched upon in the analysis section of our report. The implications have been dealt with in the body of the report, and the conclusions seem usually self-evident.

Personal Observations and Judgments

In retrospect we find outselves not sympathetic to the view that faculty unionism constitutes just one more facet of a campus milieu, one among many which at times support and at times place constraints upon the achievement of institutional mission. Rather, we are inclined to believe that collective bargaining has a fundamental significance. While stress in practice may be on the more mundane concept called "terms and conditions of employment," we view unionism rather as a continuation of a long-range striving on the part of faculty members, as professionals with an expertise in teaching and specialized knowledge, to improve their influence on decisions which affect their services. Until recently this has taken the form of an emphasis on collegiality or shared authority. In collective bargaining the means are quite different; but from this perspective they constitute an activity critical to the academic functioning of colleges and universities and, therefore, to the concerns of regional accreditation. We see no alternative to the necessity for regional associations to give concerted attention to academic collective bargaining to the end of incorporating its existence into their policies and practices.

Thus, in concluding this report we feel impelled to add several personal observations and judgments which have been impressed upon us during the course of the study, but which have a basis more in our personal reactions than upon the study itself.

To begin with, we believe that collective bargaining on the part of faculty members adds a dimension to unionized colleges and universities which calls for

explicit consideration on the part of regional accrediting bodies. It constitutes a force so intimately related to the nature of faculty service and thus, directly or indirectly, to the academic program of an institution that it of necessity will intrude into those criteria of major concern for evaluation. It involves a contractual relationship with the institution's administration which sets a number of important parameters, primarily related to "terms and conditions of employment," perhaps, but inevitably interrelating with decisions in academic, fiscal, and public relations areas. Thus, we suggest that it is entirely appropriate, if not essential, that visiting teams add to their assessment of administrative leaderhsip a judgment as to how well collective bargaining relationships are maintained. Has the president, in directing negotiations, for example, demonstrated sophistication about collective bargaining and insight as to its impact on the capacity of the campus to effect its mission? Does the administrative team provide strong personnel procedures and include a negotiator who reflects the impact of decisions upon academic endeavors?

Pressing forward with our conviction that academic unionism does constitute a significant new force in higher education—at least for a major number of two-year and four-year colleges—we sense that some formal communication between offices of accrediting bodies and those of the national faculty associations will prove constructive. This should provide for a more creative understanding of the purposes and processes of both unionism and accreditation and blunt what we perceive to be inevitable conflicts of interest between the two activities. It might serve in this connection to arrange for representation of the union point of view on accrediting associations' councils, although this presents problems in terms of the competition among faculty unions.

Clearly, there should be an effort to make sure that teams visiting unionized campuses include individuals who understand collective bargaining. Regional associations could make provision for the local administration and the local bargaining unit each to nominate one member of the visiting team wherever the evaluation calls for a broad institutional overview. While this may encourage the entry of adversarial feelings and endeavors, the team chairman and the balance of the team might profit from the exchange and be exposed to dimensions of the institution entirely appropriate to an accreditation study in a unionized setting.

For some time there has been recognition of the importance of faculty participation in the decision-making processes, particularly with regard to curriculum, staff selection, professional development programs, and long-range planning. Accrediting teams have customarily inquired into such matters. The incentive for doing so, however, has rested on rather general and implicit association statements. Perhaps these should be reviewed with the intent of making the concepts more specific, and, in particular, assuring more active participation by the faculty, quite possibly through its bargaining agent, in preparation for accrediting including the process of evaluation which results in the self-study report.

It appears that faculty unionization will continue to expand. Regional accreditation should be prepared to make the necessary adjustments rather than

risk the possibility of major differences with established unions and the uncertainties to which these might lead. We trust these somewhat more personal observations will be helpful to the process of adaptation.

OTHER PAPERS IN THIS SERIES

Issued

Accreditation and the Public Interest, by William K. Selden; 20 pp., $1.50. One of the more prolific writers on the topic of accreditation—as well as a long-time "friendly critic" of the process—adds this important paper to the literature. Long an advocate of greater public involvement in accreditation, Dr. Selden in this paper traces some of the historical and philosophical trends that now seem to mandate such involvement and makes recommendations as to how public representatives might be chosen to serve on accrediting commissions, boards, and committees. (June 1976)

Confidentiality and Accreditation, by Louis H. Heilbron; 36 pp., $2.50. Mr. Heilbron, a COPA public Board member, is an attorney at law who has written extensively on educational matters, particularly in the field of governance. In this paper he explores the legal implications of the confidential procedures inherent in the accrediting process. One of his conclusions urges accrediting agencies to restudy their procedures with respect to records and meetings to be certain that they are as open to public scrutiny as the essential purposes of accreditation permit. (July 1976)

Respective Roles of Federal Government, State Governments, and Private Accrediting Agencies in the Governance of Postsecondary Education, by William A. Kaplin; 31 pp., $2.00. This report by a respected legal scholar knowledgeable in accreditation explores the current and future status of the education "Triad" inherent in the title with particular reference to determining eligibility for federal funds. (July 1975)

Educational Auditing and Accountability, by Fred F. Harcleroad; 36 pp., $2.00. Dr. Harcleroad reports on developments in the field of voluntary accreditation and the applicability of auditing systems to the evaluation of the success of educational institutions in meeting "generally accepted educational standards." Examples of an "educational prospectus" similar to an SEC disclosure prospectus, as well as an auditor's "letter of opinion," are included. (August 1976)

In Preparation by Authors

Accreditation: Its Purposes and Uses, by William K. Selden and Harry V. Porter. These two "old pros" in accreditation are rethinking its purposes and contributions in the light of such recent developments as redefinition of the education universe, the downturn in economic conditions and leveling enrollments, emergence of "non-traditional" institutions, development of multi-campus systems and satellite campus operations, the student consumer protection movement, increased activity of state and federal agencies in many of the above, and the continuing proliferation of professions and their resultant accrediting activity. (Available early in 1977)

How the Triad Should Work (tentative title), by Richard Fulton, former Executive Director and now General Counsel of the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools. Mr. Fulton originally conceived and promoted the "triad of responsibility" concept in testimony before various Congressional committees. He will attempt in his paper to outline the appropriate areas of responsibility for each element of the triad. (Available Spring 1977)

None of these Occasional Papers and the conclusions and recommendations they contain necessarily represent an official viewpoint of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. They are written to stimulate discussion; some are provocative, some may be controversial, others may be primarily historical. All are intended to add to the literature of accreditation which has been all too sparse. From such writings, future policy might be enhanced. In the spirit of scholarship, COPA is pleased to publish this series and make the papers available at cost to all its constituents and other interested parties.